

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,247	07/21/2003	Gurkanwal Sahota	990307C1	7330
2996 7599 042029999 QUALCOMM INCORPORATED 5775 MOREHOUSE DR.			EXAMINER	
			VUONG, QI	VUONG, QUOCHIEN B
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/20/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com kascanla@qualcomm.com nanm@qualcomm.com

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/624,247	SAHOTA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Quochien B. Vuong	2618		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --1. 🛛 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this

application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request

THE REPLY FILED 23 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time
periods:
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) Mean The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.79(b).
NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDIMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ∑ for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ∑ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(a).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1 and 22, Applicant argues that Lippman (US, 5371,500) and Cook (US 4,894,684) fail to disclose an interface circuit formed on a first integrated circuit (IC) for generating a different current signal response to a reference and a digital data input." The examiner, however, does not agree with the Applicant, Lipmann (figue 1; and col. 2, line 32 - col. 3, line 26) discloses an interface circuit formed on a first IC for generating an output signal response to a referece signal and a digital data input signal. Lipman does not disclose the output signal being a differental current signal. However, Cook (figure 1; col. 2, line 48 - col. 3, line 13) disclose generating a different current signal response to two signals: a digital data input (17) and another signal (19). Therefore, the combination of Lippman and Cook reads on the claimed limitation of claims 1 and 22.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
13. Other:

/Quochien B Vuong/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20090415